

# FY20: Sustainable Materials Management Anaerobic Digestion Funding Opportunity

## Supporting Anaerobic Digestion in Communities RFA

### ~Scoring Sheet~

Instructions: Please fill out all of the information in the cells provided.

Grants.gov Tracking Number:	188189062
Applicant Name:	Solana Center for Environmental Innovation
Project Title:	Regional Excellence in Anaerobic Digester Input
State:	California
Region:	R9
Reviewer's First and Last Name:	[REDACTED]
Reviewer's Organization and Region:	[REDACTED]

Exemption  
6: Personal  
Privacy

Total Ranking Score (100 Point Maximum)	Pre-Panel Score	Panel Score Changes	Final Score
	1	1	91

Exemption 5:  
Deliberative  
Process

### Evaluation Criteria

Eligible entities whose applications meet the threshold criteria in Section 3 of this announcement will be reviewed according to the evaluation criterion set forth below. Applicants must directly and explicitly address these criteria in the Template for Narrative Proposal (Appendix A). Failure to follow the required template in Appendix A may result in a reduction of up to 5 points under the "Project Summary and Approach" evaluation criterion. Each application will be rated under a points system, with a total of 100 points possible.

#### Criterion 1: Project Summary and Approach (0-25 points total)

Under this criterion, the Agency will evaluate:

a. The extent and quality to which the narrative proposal includes a well-conceived strategy for addressing the requirements in Section 1, Parts B (Scope of Work), C (EPA Strategic Plan Linkage), and D (Measuring Environmental Results: Anticipated Outcomes and Outputs). **(15 Points)**

Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)	Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)	Pre-Panel Descriptor	Pre-Panel Score	Score Change (+/-)	Final Score	Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	1	1	14	

Exemption 5:  
Deliberative  
Process

b. The extent and quality to which the narrative proposal sets forth a clear and reasonable time schedule and associated project tasks for achieving the project goals and objectives by project end. **(10 points)**

Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)	Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)	Pre-Panel Descriptor	Pre-Panel Score	Score Change (+/-)	Final Score	Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change
[REDACTED]		[REDACTED]	1		10	

Did the applicant use the Template for Narrative Proposal?

Yes ☐ No ☒ 0

#### Criterion 2: Environmental Results and Performance Measurement: Anticipated Outcomes and Outputs (0-20 points total)

Under this criterion, applications will be evaluated based on the extent to which the "Narrative Proposal" realistically describes how the project will lead to measurable environmental results. The proposal will be evaluated based on the extent and quality to which the application:

a. Clearly describes how the applicant will measure success in meeting the project's objectives. Clearly specify anticipated environmental outcomes and outputs as described in Section 1.D, Measuring Environmental Results: Anticipated Outcomes and Outputs. Outcomes and outputs must be quantitative or qualitative and must measure environmental improvement or should be directly linked to environmental improvement. Include quantitative targets as appropriate. **(10 points)**

Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)	Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)	Pre-Panel Descriptor	Pre-Panel Score	Score Change (+/-)	Final Score	Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change
[REDACTED]		[REDACTED]	1		10	

Exemption 5:  
Deliberative  
Process

b. Describes the plan for achieving project results (including the outcomes and outputs identified in Section 1). **(5 points)**

Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)	Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)	Pre-Panel Descriptor	Pre-Panel Score	Score Change (+/-)	Final Score	Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change
[REDACTED]		[REDACTED]	1		5	

c. Describes how the project is transferable to other communities. (5 points)						
Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)	Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)	Pre-Panel Descriptor	Pre-Panel Score	Score Change (+/-)	Final Score	Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change
					5	
Criterion 3: Programmatic Capability and Past Performance (0-15 points)						
Under this criterion, applicants will be evaluated based on their ability to successfully complete and manage the proposed project, taking into account:						
a. Past performance in successfully completing and managing projects, including but not limited to federal and non-federal assistance agreements described in Section 4 of this announcement. (5 points)						
Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)	Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)	Pre-Panel Descriptor	Pre-Panel Score	Score Change (+/-)	Final Score	Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change
					4	
b. History of meeting the reporting requirements under the assistance agreements described in Section 4 of this announcement. Identify whether your organization submitted acceptable final technical reports under those agreements and the extent to which the applicant adequately and timely reported on their progress towards achieving the expected outputs and outcomes under those agreements and if such progress was not being made whether the applicant adequately reported why not. (5 points)						
Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)	Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)	Pre-Panel Descriptor	Pre-Panel Score	Score Change (+/-)	Final Score	Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change
					5	
c. Organizational experience and plan for timely and successfully achieving the objectives of the proposed project. This could include staff expertise/qualifications, staff knowledge, and resources or the ability to obtain them, to successfully achieve the goals of the proposed project. (5 points)						
Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)	Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)	Pre-Panel Descriptor	Pre-Panel Score	Score Change (+/-)	Final Score	Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change
					3	
Criterion 4: Project Sustainability (0-15 points total)						
Under this criterion, applicants will be evaluated based on the extent and quality to which:						
a. The applicant can demonstrate its ability to promote and continue efforts to support AD after EPA funding for this project has ended, as described in Section 1 of the RFA. (5 points)						
Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)	Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)	Pre-Panel Descriptor	Pre-Panel Score	Score Change (+/-)	Final Score	Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change
					5	
b. The application describes the extent to which the project supports a state or local mandate, policy, or community priority to remove food waste and organic materials from the municipal waste streams. (10 points)						
Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)	Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)	Pre-Panel Descriptor	Pre-Panel Score	Score Change (+/-)	Final Score	Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change
					9	

Exemption 5:  
Deliberative  
Process

Exemption 5:  
Deliberative  
Process

Exemption 5:  
Deliberative  
Process

**Criterion 5: Effective Partnerships (0-10 points total)**

Under this criterion, the Agency will evaluate the application based on how well the applicant addresses the following:

- a. Describes the partnerships and/or coalition currently in place to support the proposed project and why it is sufficient to complete the proposed project. If the partnership will be expanded, describe the additional members that will be engaged and/or recruited.
- b. Describes the role of each partner on the project and their experience working with the target audience and/or sectors addressed. Applicants that do not plan on collaborating with other groups in project performance will be evaluated based on the extent to which they demonstrate how they will be able to effectively perform and complete the project without such collaboration. **(10 points)**

Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)	Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)	Pre-Panel Descriptor	Pre-Panel Score	Score Change (+/-)	Final Score	Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change
[REDACTED]		[REDACTED]	1		10	

Exemption 5:  
Deliberative  
Process

**Criterion 6: Budget and Expenditure of Awarded Grant Funds (0-10 points total)**

Under this criterion, the Agency will evaluate the proposed project budget and narrative to determine the extent and quality to which:

- a. Costs are reasonable to accomplish the proposed goals, objectives, and measurable environmental outcomes. **(3 points)**

Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)	Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)	Pre-Panel Descriptor	Pre-Panel Score	Score Change (+/-)	Final Score	Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	1		2	

- b. The proposed budget provides a detailed breakout of the approximate funding used for each major activity. **(4 points)**

Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)	Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)	Pre-Panel Descriptor	Pre-Panel Score	Score Change (+/-)	Final Score	Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	1		2	

Exemption 5:  
Deliberative  
Process

- c. The applicant conveys their approach, procedures, and controls for ensuring that awarded grant funds will be expended in a timely and efficient manner. **(3 points)**

Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)	Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)	Pre-Panel Descriptor	Pre-Panel Score	Score Change (+/-)	Final Score	Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change
[REDACTED]		[REDACTED]	1		3	

Exemption 5:  
Deliberative  
Process

**Criterion 7: Voluntary Leveraging (0-5 points total)**

Under this criterion, applicants will be evaluated based on the extent they demonstrate:

- a. How they will coordinate the use of EPA funding with other federal and/or non-federal sources of funds/resources to leverage additional resources beyond the grant funds awarded to carry out the proposed project(s) and/or
- b. That EPA funding will complement activities relevant to the proposed project(s) carried out by the applicant with other sources of funds or resources. Applicants will also be evaluated based on the type and amount of leveraging proposed, how the applicant will obtain the leveraged resources, the likelihood the leveraging will materialize during grant performance, the strength of the leveraging commitment, and the role the leveraged resources will play to support the proposed project activities. **(5 points)**

Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)	Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)	Pre-Panel Descriptor	Pre-Panel Score	Score Change (+/-)	Final Score	Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change
---	--	----------------------	-----------------	--------------------	-------------	--

					4	
--	--	--	--	--	---	--

**Exemption 5:  
Deliberative  
Process**

<b>General Comments</b>
If you would like to include any general comments on the applicant's response to the evaluation criteria please put them here. These comments will not impact scoring.

# FY20: Sustainable Materials Management Anaerobic Digestion Funding Opportunity

## Supporting Anaerobic Digestion in Communities RFA

### ~Scoring Sheet~

Instructions: Please fill out all of the information in the cells provided.

Grants.gov Tracking Number:	188189062
Applicant Name:	Solana Center for Environmental Innovation
Project Title:	Regional Excellence in Anaerobic Digester Input
State:	California
Region:	R9
Reviewer's First and Last Name:	[REDACTED]
Reviewer's Organization and Region:	[REDACTED]

Exemption  
6: Personal  
Privacy

Total Ranking Score (100 Point Maximum)	Pre-Panel Score	Panel Score Changes	Final Score
	1	1	88

Exemption 5: Deliberative  
Process

### Evaluation Criteria

Eligible entities whose applications meet the threshold criteria in Section 3 of this announcement will be reviewed according to the evaluation criterion set forth below. Applicants must directly and explicitly address these criteria in the Template for Narrative Proposal (Appendix A). Failure to follow the required template in Appendix A may result in a reduction of up to 5 points under the "Project Summary and Approach" evaluation criterion. Each application will be rated under a points system, with a total of 100 points possible.

#### Criterion 1: Project Summary and Approach (0-25 points total)

Under this criterion, the Agency will evaluate:

- a. The extent and quality to which the narrative proposal includes a well-conceived strategy for addressing the requirements in Section 1, Parts B (Scope of Work), C (EPA Strategic Plan Linkage), and D (Measuring Environmental Results: Anticipated Outcomes and Outputs). **(15 Points)**

Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)	Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)	Pre-Panel Descriptor	Pre-Panel Score	Score Change (+/-)	Final Score	Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	1		14	

Exemption 5:  
Deliberative  
Process

- b. The extent and quality to which the narrative proposal sets forth a clear and reasonable time schedule and associated project tasks for achieving the project goals and objectives by project end. **(10 points)**

Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)	Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)	Pre-Panel Descriptor	Pre-Panel Score	Score Change (+/-)	Final Score	Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	1		8	

Exemption 5:  
Deliberative  
Process

#### Did the applicant use the Template for Narrative Proposal?

Yes ☐ No ☒ 0

#### Criterion 2: Environmental Results and Performance Measurement: Anticipated Outcomes and Outputs (0-20 points total)

Under this criterion, applications will be evaluated based on the extent to which the "Narrative Proposal" realistically describes how the project will lead to measurable environmental results. The proposal will be evaluated based on the extent and quality to which the application:

- a. Clearly describes how the applicant will measure success in meeting the project's objectives. Clearly specify anticipated environmental outcomes and outputs as described in Section 1.D, Measuring Environmental Results: Anticipated Outcomes and Outputs. Outcomes and outputs must be quantitative or qualitative and must measure environmental improvement or should be directly linked to environmental improvement. Include quantitative targets as appropriate. **(10 points)**

Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)	Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)	Pre-Panel Descriptor	Pre-Panel Score	Score Change (+/-)	Final Score	Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	1		8	

- b. Describes the plan for achieving project results (including the outcomes and outputs identified in Section 1). **(5 points)**

Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)	Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)	Pre-Panel Descriptor	Pre-Panel Score	Score Change (+/-)	Final Score	Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	1		5	

Exemption 5:  
Deliberative  
Process

- c. Describes how the project is transferable to other communities. **(5 points)**

Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)	Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)	Pre-Panel Descriptor	Pre-Panel Score	Score Change (+/-)	Final Score	Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change

						5	
<b>Criterion 3: Programmatic Capability and Past Performance (0-15 points)</b>							
Under this criterion, applicants will be evaluated based on their ability to successfully complete and manage the proposed project, taking into account:							
a. Past performance in successfully completing and managing projects, including but not limited to federal and non-federal assistance agreements described in Section 4 of this announcement. (5 points)							
Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)	Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)	Pre-Panel Descriptor	Pre-Panel Score	Score Change (+/-)	Final Score	Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change	
					4		
b. History of meeting the reporting requirements under the assistance agreements described in Section 4 of this announcement. Identify whether your organization submitted acceptable final technical reports under those agreements and the extent to which the applicant adequately and timely reported on their progress towards achieving the expected outputs and outcomes under those agreements and if such progress was not being made whether the applicant adequately reported why not. (5 points)							
Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)	Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)	Pre-Panel Descriptor	Pre-Panel Score	Score Change (+/-)	Final Score	Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change	
					4		
c. Organizational experience and plan for timely and successfully achieving the objectives of the proposed project. This could include staff expertise/qualifications, staff knowledge, and resources or the ability to obtain them, to successfully achieve the goals of the proposed project. (5 points)							
Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)	Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)	Pre-Panel Descriptor	Pre-Panel Score	Score Change (+/-)	Final Score	Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change	
					2		
<b>Criterion 4: Project Sustainability (0-15 points total)</b>							
Under this criterion, applicants will be evaluated based on the extent and quality to which:							
a. The applicant can demonstrate its ability to promote and continue efforts to support AD after EPA funding for this project has ended, as described in Section 1 of the RFA. (5 points)							
Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)	Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)	Pre-Panel Descriptor	Pre-Panel Score	Score Change (+/-)	Final Score	Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change	
					5		
b. The application describes the extent to which the project supports a state or local mandate, policy, or community priority to remove food waste and organic materials from the municipal waste streams. (10 points)							
Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)	Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)	Pre-Panel Descriptor	Pre-Panel Score	Score Change (+/-)	Final Score	Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change	
					9		
<b>Criterion 5: Effective Partnerships (0-10 points total)</b>							
Under this criterion, the Agency will evaluate the application based on how well the applicant addresses the following:							
a. Describes the partnerships and/or coalition currently in place to support the proposed project and why it is sufficient to complete the proposed project. If the partnership will be expanded, describe the additional members that will be engaged and/or recruited.							
b. Describes the role of each partner on the project and their experience working with the target audience and/or sectors addressed. Applicants that do not plan on collaborating with other groups in project performance will be evaluated based on the extent to which they demonstrate how they will be able to effectively perform and complete the project without such collaboration. (10 points)							
Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)	Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)	Pre-Panel Descriptor	Pre-Panel Score	Score Change (+/-)	Final Score	Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change	
					10		
<b>Criterion 6: Budget and Expenditure of Awarded Grant Funds (0-10 points total)</b>							
Under this criterion, the Agency will evaluate the proposed project budget and narrative to determine the extent and quality to which:							
a. Costs are reasonable to accomplish the proposed goals, objectives, and measurable environmental outcomes. (3 points)							
Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)	Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)	Pre-Panel Descriptor	Pre-Panel Score	Score Change (+/-)	Final Score	Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change	

Exemption 5:  
Deliberative  
Process

Exemption 5:  
Deliberative  
Process

Exemption 5:  
Deliberative  
Process

Exemption 5:  
Deliberative  
Process

						2	
b. The proposed budget provides a detailed breakout of the approximate funding used for each major activity. (4 points)							
Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)	Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)	Pre-Panel Descriptor	Pre-Panel Score	Score Change (+/-)	Final Score	Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change	
					4		
c. The applicant conveys their approach, procedures, and controls for ensuring that awarded grant funds will be expended in a timely and efficient manner. (3 points)							
Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)	Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)	Pre-Panel Descriptor	Pre-Panel Score	Score Change (+/-)	Final Score	w	
Criterion 7: Voluntary Leveraging (0-5 points total)							
Under this criterion, applicants will be evaluated based on the extent they demonstrate:							
a. How they will coordinate the use of EPA funding with other federal and/or non-federal sources of funds/resources to leverage additional resources beyond the grant funds awarded to carry out the proposed project(s) and/or							
b. That EPA funding will complement activities relevant to the proposed project(s) carried out by the applicant with other sources of funds or resources. Applicants will also be evaluated based on the type and amount of leveraging proposed, how the applicant will obtain the leveraged resources, the likelihood the leveraging will materialize during grant performance, the strength of the leveraging commitment, and the role the leveraged resources will play to support the proposed project activities. (5 points)							
Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)	Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)	Pre-Panel Descriptor	Pre-Panel Score	Score Change (+/-)	Final Score	Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change	
					5		
General Comments							
If you would like to include any general comments on the applicant's response to the evaluation criteria please put them here. These comments will not impact scoring.							

Exemption 5:  
Deliberative  
Process

Exemption 5:  
Deliberative  
Process

# FY20: Sustainable Materials Management Anaerobic Digestion Funding Opportunity

## Supporting Anaerobic Digestion in Communities RFA

### ~Scoring Sheet~

Instructions: Please fill out all of the information in the cells provided.

Grants.gov Tracking Number:	188189062
Applicant Name:	Solana Center for Environmental Innovation
Project Title:	Regional Excellence in Anaerobic Digester Input
State:	California
Region:	R9
Reviewer's First and Last Name:	[REDACTED]
Reviewer's Organization and Region:	[REDACTED]

Exemption  
6: Personal  
Privacy

Total Ranking Score (100 Point Maximum)	Pre-Panel Score	Panel Score Changes	Final Score
	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	94

Exemption 5: Deliberative Process

### Evaluation Criteria

Eligible entities whose applications meet the threshold criteria in Section 3 of this announcement will be reviewed according to the evaluation criterion set forth below. Applicants must directly and explicitly address these criteria in the Template for Narrative Proposal (Appendix A). Failure to follow the required template in Appendix A may result in a reduction of up to 5 points under the "Project Summary and Approach" evaluation criterion. Each application will be rated under a points system, with a total of 100 points possible.

#### Criterion 1: Project Summary and Approach (0-25 points total)

Under this criterion, the Agency will evaluate:

- a. The extent and quality to which the narrative proposal includes a well-conceived strategy for addressing the requirements in Section 1, Parts B (Scope of Work), C (EPA Strategic Plan Linkage), and D (Measuring Environmental Results: Anticipated Outcomes and Outputs). **(15 Points)**

Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)	Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)	Pre-Panel Descriptor	Pre-Panel Score	Score Change (+/-)	Final Score	Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	13	

Exemption 5:  
Deliberative  
Process

- b. The extent and quality to which the narrative proposal sets forth a clear and reasonable time schedule and associated project tasks for achieving the project goals and objectives by project end. **(10 points)**

Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)	Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)	Pre-Panel Descriptor	Pre-Panel Score	Score Change (+/-)	Final Score	Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	10	[REDACTED]

Exemption 5:  
Deliberative  
Process

Did the applicant use the Template for Narrative Proposal?

Yes ☐ No ☒ 0

#### Criterion 2: Environmental Results and Performance Measurement: Anticipated Outcomes and Outputs (0-20 points total)

Under this criterion, applications will be evaluated based on the extent to which the "Narrative Proposal" realistically describes how the project will lead to measurable environmental results. The proposal will be evaluated based on the extent and quality to which the application:

- a. Clearly describes how the applicant will measure success in meeting the project's objectives. Clearly specify anticipated environmental outcomes and outputs as described in Section 1.D, Measuring Environmental Results: Anticipated Outcomes and Outputs. Outcomes and outputs must be quantitative or qualitative and must measure environmental improvement or should be directly linked to environmental improvement. Include quantitative targets as appropriate. **(10 points)**



Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)	Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)	Pre-Panel Descriptor	Pre-Panel Score	Score Change (+/-)	Final Score	Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change
					10	

Exemption 5:  
Deliberative  
Process

b. Describes the plan for achieving project results (including the outcomes and outputs identified in Section 1). (5 points)

Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)	Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)	Pre-Panel Descriptor	Pre-Panel Score	Score Change (+/-)	Final Score	Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change
					5	

Exemption 5:  
Deliberative  
Process

c. Describes how the project is transferable to other communities. (5 points)

Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)	Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)	Pre-Panel Descriptor	Pre-Panel Score	Score Change (+/-)	Final Score	Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change
					5	

Criterion 3: Programmatic Capability and Past Performance (0-15 points)

Under this criterion, applicants will be evaluated based on their ability to successfully complete and manage the proposed project, taking into account:

a. Past performance in successfully completing and managing projects, including but not limited to federal and non-federal assistance agreements described in Section 4 of this announcement. (5 points)

Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)	Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)	Pre-Panel Descriptor	Pre-Panel Score	Score Change (+/-)	Final Score	Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change
					5	

Exemption 5:  
Deliberative  
Process

b. History of meeting the reporting requirements under the assistance agreements described in Section 4 of this announcement. Identify whether your organization submitted acceptable final technical reports under those agreements and the extent to which the applicant adequately and timely reported on their progress towards achieving the expected outputs and outcomes under those agreements and if such progress was not being made whether the applicant adequately reported why not. (5 points)

Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)	Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)	Pre-Panel Descriptor	Pre-Panel Score	Score Change (+/-)	Final Score	Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change
					5	

c. Organizational experience and plan for timely and successfully achieving the objectives of the proposed project. This could include staff expertise/qualifications, staff knowledge, and resources or the ability to obtain them, to successfully achieve the goals of the proposed project. (5 points)

Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)	Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)	Pre-Panel Descriptor	Pre-Panel Score	Score Change (+/-)	Final Score	Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change
---	--	----------------------	-----------------	--------------------	-------------	--

<b>Criterion 4: Project Sustainability (0-15 points total)</b>							
Under this criterion, applicants will be evaluated based on the extent and quality to which:							
a. The applicant can demonstrate its ability to promote and continue efforts to support AD after EPA funding for this project has ended, as described in Section 1 of the RFA. (5 points)							
Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)	Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)	Pre-Panel Descriptor	Pre-Panel Score	Score Change (+/-)	Final Score	Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change	
					5		
b. The application describes the extent to which the project supports a state or local mandate, policy, or community priority to remove food waste and organic materials from the municipal waste streams. (10 points)							
Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)	Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)	Pre-Panel Descriptor	Pre-Panel Score	Score Change (+/-)	Final Score	Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change	
					10		
<b>Criterion 5: Effective Partnerships (0-10 points total)</b>							
Under this criterion, the Agency will evaluate the application based on how well the applicant addresses the following:							
a. Describes the partnerships and/or coalition currently in place to support the proposed project and why it is sufficient to complete the proposed project. If the partnership will be expanded, describe the additional members that will be engaged and/or recruited.							
b. Describes the role of each partner on the project and their experience working with the target audience and/or sectors addressed. Applicants that do not plan on collaborating with other groups in project performance will be evaluated based on the extent to which they demonstrate how they will be able to effectively perform and complete the project without such collaboration. (10 points)							
Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)	Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)	Pre-Panel Descriptor	Pre-Panel Score	Score Change (+/-)	Final Score	Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change	
					9		
<b>Criterion 6: Budget and Expenditure of Awarded Grant Funds (0-10 points total)</b>							
Under this criterion, the Agency will evaluate the proposed project budget and narrative to determine the extent and quality to which:							
a. Costs are reasonable to accomplish the proposed goals, objectives, and measurable environmental outcomes. (3 points)							
Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)	Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)	Pre-Panel Descriptor	Pre-Panel Score	Score Change (+/-)	Final Score	Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change	
					3		
b. The proposed budget provides a detailed breakout of the approximate funding used for each major activity. (4 points)							
Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)	Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)	Pre-Panel Descriptor	Pre-Panel Score	Score Change (+/-)	Final Score	Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change	
					3		
c. The applicant conveys their approach, procedures, and controls for ensuring that awarded grant funds will be expended in a timely and efficient manner. (3 points)							
Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)	Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)	Pre-Panel Descriptor	Pre-Panel Score	Score Change (+/-)	Final Score	Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change	
					3		
<b>Criterion 7: Voluntary Leveraging (0-5 points total)</b>							
Under this criterion, applicants will be evaluated based on the extent they demonstrate:							

### Exemption 5: Deliberative Process

### Exemption 5: Deliberative Process

a. How they will coordinate the use of EPA funding with other federal and/or non-federal sources of funds/resources to leverage additional resources beyond the grant funds awarded to carry out the proposed project(s) and/or

b. That EPA funding will complement activities relevant to the proposed project(s) carried out by the applicant with other sources of funds or resources. Applicants will also be evaluated based on the type and amount of leveraging proposed, how the applicant will obtain the leveraged resources, the likelihood the leveraging will materialize during grant performance, the strength of the leveraging commitment, and the role the leveraged resources will play to support the proposed project activities. (5 points)

Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)	Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)	Pre-Panel Descriptor	Pre-Panel Score	Score Change (+/-)	Final Score	Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change
					4	

Exemption 5:  
Deliberative  
Process

General Comments

If you would like to include any general comments on the applicant's response to the evaluation criteria please put them here. These comments will not impact scoring.